

Reflections Regarding The 2013 State Of The Union Address

by

Dr. Frederick Meekins

In his state of the union, President Obama promised to reduce taxpayer subsidies to prescription drug companies. While doing so sounds like a free market proposal, what is to prevent such a move from causing drugs to skyrocket even higher?

In regards to climate change, President Obama said, "We choose to believe that Superstorm Sandy...and the worst wildfires some states have ever seen were all just a freak coincidence? Or we can choose to believe in the overwhelming judgment of science." Weren't some of history's greatest abridgments of human liberty committed by those wielding government power determining what did and did not constitute legitimate science?

In regards to climate change, President Obama threatened, "Now, the good news is we can make meaningful progress pm this issue while driving strong economic growth....But if Congress won't act soon to protect future generations, I will direct my Cabinet to come up with executive actions...to reduce pollution, prepare our communities for the consequences of climate change, and speed the transition to more sustainable sources of energy."

In other words, if duly elected representatives of the American people do not present him with what he deems to be acceptable environmental legislation, the President is going to implement what amounts to an environmental dictatorship. That's what you call such wide sweeping action that is not authorized by congressional approval.

Just how far is the President threatening to take this if there is to be no check placed upon his power? For example, what if he decides that the measure necessary to reduce pollution and speed the transition to more sustainable sources of energy consists of forbidding you to own or operate a motor vehicle that is powered by an internal combustion engine that runs on fossil fuels?

Even more frightening is the phrase in that statement, "prepare our communities for the consequences of climate change." Since America's system of Checks and Balances (and thus the very principles of the Constitution) mean next to nothing to the President in this regard, what if he decides that means forcibly relocating populations living in environmentally strategic or critical areas to designated relocation camps where those overseeing such FEMA detention

centers attempt to curtail the contact of the inmates with the outside world. Don't accuse me of having lost it. This actually happened when a relocation center administrator attempted to prevent residents from talking to journalists following Hurricane Katrina.

According to President Obama, China is really "going all in on clean energy" and thus, "so we must." Or, is the People's Republic merely positioning itself in such a way as to dupe us into following suit, instead pursuing an energy policy that meets its needs irrespective of applause and accolades on the world stage?

In pursuit of his call for an environmentalist dictatorship in the 2013 State of the Union address, President Obama called for the establishment of an Energy Security Trust. The purpose of this is to "drive new research and technology to shift our cars and trucks off oil for good."

The observant will note that there is nothing in that statement about improving the mileage of electric vehicles so that you will be able to go beyond a radius of about 50 miles if you want to return home on a single charge in a single day. Neither is much said about the average person being able to afford one of these electrified vehicles.

Social planners of the Obama-supporting variety in fact view the automobile as one of the greatest threats undermining their utopian collectivist vision. For instead of going where you want, these elites prefer you confine yourself to your COMMUNITY where the only commodities available to you will be those deemed "local" to a particular area and your access to them will not be at your convenience but rather according to a centralized time table as epitomized by the public transportation system that will increasingly displace reliance upon the private automobile.

According to Obama, you as an individual are unfit to run your own life and instead you must rely on the government to oversee the priorities of your personal economy. Obama declared, "I'm also issuing a new goal for America. Let's cut in half the energy wasted by our homes and businesses over the next 20 years."

Once again, the discerning must go back and examine what the President said rather than what we would like to hear.

For starters, just because "he" set a goal, why ought we to care and even more importantly comply. Just because his voice shouts, "ACHTUNG!" does that mean we are required to click our heels and march in unison?

Some will reply, "But what's so wrong with cutting back so we can save on our energy bills."

Nothing, but that is not what the President said.

Nowhere did the President say that the goals of these efforts are to reduce costs for the average consumer. During his initial campaigns for national elected office, Barack Obama openly and admittedly warned that, under his energy plans, rates would necessarily skyrocket.

And even when Americans prudently decide to conserve energy for whatever their individual motivation, do not assume that the money that they did save will remain in their wallets for very long. For as soon as they surrender to the admonitions on the part of their rulers, these leaders are warning as to the next crisis originating as a result of the masses doing as they are instructed like lemmings over the side of a cliff.

For example, when fuel costs began to rise along with a confluence of other technological developments, a number of motorists switched to more fuel efficient vehicles. However, policy technocrats were not content with this level of conditioning because decreased amounts of fuel consumed resulted in fewer gallons of gas purchased and thus resulting in fewer gas tax dollars collected.

To punish motorists for moving towards more fuel efficient vehicles, statisticians now intend to impose on top of the tax for each gallon of gas purchased an additional tax upon each mile driven. Such a proposal is actually a greater intrusion into your privacy.

Under a gas tax regimen, motorists are penalized for each gallon of gas that they decide to purchase. However, beyond that, the assessment and the collection of the tax does not care how and when you decide to make use of the gasoline as a motor vehicle propellant.

A mileage tax involves a greater degree of government intrusion. For to assess the tax, it is proposed that a computerized sensor would be attached to your motor vehicle cataloging how many miles that you have driven the vehicle. Given the sophistication of such tracking technology, there is no reason its parameters could not be modified to financially penalize motorists driving into particular areas or at peak hours in a manner similar to the way subway passengers are charged higher rates for utilizing public transportation during rush hour even though that is what they are admonished to do by assorted forms of government propaganda.

It is said that totalitarian regimes are characterized by a cradle to grave mentality where it is argued that government interference at every stage of existence is necessary to forestall the encroaching societal collapse that the government has itself played a considerable role in stoking and fomenting.

In regards to his lavish entitlement programs for the otherwise able-bodied, Obama continued in his oration, "These initiatives in manufacturing, energy, infrastructure, housing --- all these things will help entrepreneurs and small business expand and create new jobs. But none of it will matter unless we also equip our citizens with the skills and training to fill these jobs."

However, by that, he does not mean the establishment of an education system that focuses on academic basics such as reading comprehension, scientific skills, and a grounding in America's constitutional history while cutting down on frivolity such as psychological conditioning and pandering to multiculturalism. Obama clarified, "And that has to start at the earliest possible age. Study after study shows that sooner a child begins learning, the better he or she does down the road."

The President went on to lament how only around a third of four year olds are enrolled in a "high quality" preschool. To correct this situation, Obama proposed making high quality preschool available to every single child in America.

But what if every parent does not want that for their children, instead preferring that the earliest years of their children's live (and perhaps even beyond that for the families that decide to pursue alternative forms of education) to be shaped by the philosophers and values of the parents rather than by educratic community organizers? What guarantees are there that making preschool available for every child will not translate from Obamaese as compulsory for every child?

Just how early does the government claim to your child begin? For the sake of the COMMUNITY, should a social worker be on hand to whisk children away to be raised in a government facility as soon as infants pop out of the birth canal?

Thanks in part to this President and his spokestramp Sandra Fluke, America is on its way to having not so much a chicken in every pot but rather a government-provided birth control pill in every medicine cabinet. How much longer until the culture is indistinguishable from that described in Aldous Huxley's "Brave New World" where children are no longer born into the families of loving married couples but rather in factory vats predetermined before birth as to what function they will fulfill in the broader society and where idiotized masses have their critical faculties further anaesthetized by unending rounds of increasingly hedonistic pleasure?

President Obama continued on in the 2013 State of the Union Address, "Let's also make sure that a high school diploma puts our kids on the path to a good job." He observed that, when a German student graduates, students there already possess the equivalent of an associate's degree. The President stated specifically, "They've been trained for the jobs that are there."

Perhaps Mr. Obama should address if, when they go to school, perhaps the Germans are being schooled in actual academic subjects and not in psychobabble programming the student to despise individual achievement, the free market system, and the fact that their country even exists as is taught in many of America's government schools. Secondly, why bother studying for these "jobs that are there" when there aren't really any jobs there thanks in part to stiffening regulations being imposed by this very President. Why bother committing the complexities of science to mind when the highest you are likely ever going to achieve is to repeat the mantras of "Hi, welcome to Wal-Mart" or "Would you like fries with that?" And this if you rank among the lucky few to even have a job.

However, if you are a run of the mill American, it is likely that the President is not as concerned about your advancement and prosperity as he is about the illegals invading America's shores. On this issue, the President declared, "Our economy is stronger when we harness the talents and ingenuity of...immigrants. And right now, leaders from business, labor, law enforcement, faith communities --- they all agree that the time has come to pass comprehensive immigration reform."

From the sound of it, actual Americans are not capable of accomplishing anything if granted the opportunity. If that is the case, and as Obama remarked years ago in a graduation oration that life is not about material success, wouldn't we be doing immigrants a favor for their own long term good if we deny them admission to the United States. After all, according to the President's own logic, won't each generation of these people that reproduce be diluting their "blood and soil" (to use the terminology of one particular brand of socialism) the longer they are in America?

And just because leaders from business, labor, law enforcement and faith communities want increased numbers of immigrants, has anyone stopped to ask what the run of the mill American wants. After all, it will be average Americans who will be forced to shell out additional welfare payments to the new arrivals and whose neighborhoods will decrease in terms of both property values and aesthetic appeal as migrants pile multiple families into single family homes while refusing to abide by traditional standards of cleanliness and upkeep in terms of maintaining their dwellings. However, each of the above special interests often harbor reasons for supporting increased levels of immigration that have nothing whatsoever to do with an altruistic concern for the betterment of the immigrant.

Business has an interest in increased numbers of immigrants in order to depress wages. Furthermore, in some of the proposed reforms, temporary workers will willingly put up with out of fear of being deported, any number of deprivations and abuses the average American up until recently would not have put up with.

Labor is interested in increased immigration hoping that these swarms of transients, barely literate in their native tongue with English comprehension almost nonexistent, will be so overwhelmed by their new surroundings that they will in a docile fashion fill the ranks of union membership while relenting to the decisions made by these thuggish fatcats. In turn, as the union coffers swell, these radical organizations will be able to increase their influence over elections, outrightly buy candidates, and even threaten social upheaval when governments and industry fail to meet an ever increasing list of demands.

It would be interesting to determine in regards to law enforcement if it is the rank and file beat cop or rather those craving higher-level administrative and appointed positions that favor increased levels of immigration and entitlements lavished upon illegals already here. For those seeking advancement will parrot whatever they are told to by their masters in the bureaucracy, elected office, civil rights establishment, and the nefarious shadowy forces manipulating these players in the policy process.

Likewise, it is more than likely high ranking members of the clergy rather than run of the mill mundane pew fillers that want America overrun with foreigners. Though few are willing to admit it, leftists in both the Catholic Church and certain wings of Protestantism (especially the mainline and Emergent Church movement) would like to see nothing better than the diminution of the United States as a global power and the dilution of Americans as a distinct world people.

Some of the most disturbing implications of President Obama's 2013 State Of The Union Address could be found towards the conclusion of his speech in terms of those he planted in the gallery to be applauded as ideal citizens.

Obama began, "We should follow the example of a New York City nurse named Menchu Sanchez. When Hurricane Sandy plunged her hospital into darkness, she wasn't thinking about how her home was fairing. Her mind was on the twenty precious newborns in her care and the rescue plan she devised that kept them all safe."

While her efforts are to be commended, the really interesting aspect of this statement is how it is couched in terms as an attack on private property. But while you aren't to give second thought as to the material components of existence, it seems as if the thoughts of the President and his consort dwell upon the creature comforts to the exclusion of nearly everything else.

On February 12, 2013, the President was lecturing is as to how we are suppose to be so COMMUNITY oriented that, during times of crises, we aren't even suppose to entertain the concern as to whether or not we will even have a place of our own once the flood water subside. However, this public official, who is pretty much assured that he will never have to sleep with

one eye open in a FEMA compound or shelter such as the Louisiana Superdome, just two days later was taking his wife out to a \$900 Valentine dinner.

What American these days can afford a \$900 Valentine dinner? This is thanks in part to the economy that has continued to decline in large measure as a result of this President's very policies.

But apparently that week it was not enough to blow in one night of eating out on the town more than many of us bring home per pay check each week after taxes. His Highness then went to Florida where he enjoyed a \$1000 golf lesson with Tiger Woods and his beloved battle ax frittered around the Midwest in large part telling the rest of us what we may and may not eat.

It is not enough that you should be willing to surrender your property without hesitation at the President's command. Apparently you are expected to lay down your life as well.

The President further admonished, "We should follow the example of police officer Brian Murphy. When a gunman opened fire on a Sikh temple in Wisconsin and Brian was the first to arrive, he did not consider his own safety. He fought back...even as he lay bleeding from 12 bullet wounds."

But how does the high and mighty Barack expect us to accomplish this? Gun control proposals such as those favored by the President would contract who may be allowed to possess a firearm and into which venues one may be authorized to take such an implement of personal protection.

In the address, the President shared that this valiant police officer fought back despite twelve bullet wounds. But without his weapon and if he had emulated the tactics we are encouraged to employ when confronting homicidal assailants, do you honestly believe that this police officer would have sustained only twelve bullet wounds? In all likelihood, he would have instead been dead.

It seems that throughout the 2013 State of The Union, the President presented the American people a litany of individuals aspiring to the kinds of values that he upholds. The thing of it is, apparently one of the values is not a critical mind or providing the audience with all of the available facts.

For example, of Desiline Victor, the American people were told the following: "When Desiline arrived at her polling place, she was told the wait to vote might be six hours. And as the time ticked by, her concern was not with her tired body or aching feet, but whether folks like her would get to have their say. And hour after hour, a throng of people stayed in line to support her --- because Desiline is 102 years old. And they erupted in cheers when she finally put on a

sticker that read 'I voted'."

Firstly, the President failed to point out that Desiline Victor barely speaks a lick of English, having come to America late in life not so much to contribute economically to the nation but rather in all likelihood to suck off the welfare system. Thus, how do we not know that this six hour delay was not in part her own fault probably demanding to be catered to in her own native jibberish?

Secondly, if Desiline Victor likes to draw attention to herself by demanding that the voting experience be conducted in a language other than English, why didn't she stir up a fuss that she was 102 years old? Maybe if she had, a number ahead of her would have graciously allowed her to vote before they did.

This senior citizen (if we must increase the age at which one qualifies for Social Security perhaps we ought to lower the cutoff age after which one no longer qualifies to become a citizen) is being recognized in the annals of Presidential rhetoric as a way to shame vast numbers of American people into complying with any number of bureaucratic policy directives. However, the only people that should be feeling any guilt are those that actually know this woman.

At 102 years of age, if it was known that Desiline Victor possessed enough of what passes as mind in Democratic circles wanted to vote, why didn't someone in her family assist her in obtaining an absentee ballot? After all, I am sure those around here have little problem in beseeching the government for assistance more financial or tangible in nature anyway.

Most of the time, many people are in awe upon hearing of someone that approaches and/or surpasses the centenarian threshold since the vast majority fail to hold on that long. However, perhaps she should not be viewed as so pitiable and thus suitable to be used as a tool by which to shame the rest of us into compliance with whatever tactics the political leadership is attempting to manipulate us.

The President conveys the impression that Desiline Victor had to wait uncomfortably for six hours away from the warmth and comforts of her own home or bed. However, it must be remembered that she was not brought in from an apartment complex or retirement community just down the street from the White House.

For its political purposes, the Obama Administration had this 102 year old woman shipped in from Florida. Such a journey --- irrespective of mode of transportation --- would be taxing on someone half her age or even someone half the age of someone half her age. So if Desiline Victor is able to travel from Florida to DC to be paraded about like some freak show curiosity, then perhaps she is deserving of no more pity than anybody else whose opportunity to vote was

delayed by such a temporal interval.

The President uplifting Desiline Victor raises another interesting observation regarding some of the parameters believed to be lurking beneath the surface of the Obamacare program. Suppose for a moment that Desiline Victor was as frail as government propagandists have led the American people into believing. Had Desiline Victor fallen ill as a result of having either waited an exorbitant amount of time to vote or from traveling the hundreds of miles from Florida to the nation's capital, would the medical bureaucracy put in place by the President and his legislative allies deem her life worth of sustaining or restoring?

If not, what the President is calling for in this example is nothing short of a willingness to die for the political objectives on the part of civilians in circumstances that in no legitimate way can be considered a national emergency. Mind you, this is an individual whose idea of personal sacrifice at this point in his life consists of helicoptering to Camp David for the weekend rather than \$1000 golf lessons with Tiger Woods or having to eat a pizza other than one deliberately flown in from Chicago.

The purpose of a President's annual address before Congress is to update the federal legislative body and, by extension of broadcast media technology, those tuning in. From the assumptions from which many of Obama's policies are formulated, the United States is edging ever closer to the ledge of that cliff from which the nation will never recover should it go over and ultimately slide off.

by Frederick Meekins